

REMARKS

1. Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed October 13, 2010, the disposition of the claims is as follows:

Claims 10 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,165), in view of McLampy (U.S. Patent No. 7,028,092), Acharya (U.S. Patent No. 7,110,359), and Daniels-Barnes (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,277).

Claims 13 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, in view of McLampy, Acharya, Daniels-Barnes, and Luther (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0023877).

Claims 27 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, in view of McLampy, Acharya, Daniels-Barnes, and O'Neill (European Patent No. EP 1,137,236).

Claims 28 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, in view of McLampy, Acharya, Daniels-Barnes, O'Neill, Faccin (U.S. Patent No. 7,024,688), and Donovan ("SIP Session Timer").

Claims 29 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, in view of McLampy, Acharya, Daniels-Barnes, and Edwards (U.S. Patent No. 6,744,877).

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, in view of McLampy, Acharya, Daniels-Barnes, and Luther.

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, in view of McLampy, Acharya, Daniels-Barnes, Luther, and Wallenius (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,813).

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman, in view of McLampy, Acharya, Daniels-Barnes, Luther, and Edwards.

Claim 39 stands objected to, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form.

2. Status of the claims

Currently pending are claims 10, 13, 16, 26, 29-30, 37 and 40. Of these, claims 10, 13, and 26 are independent.

3. Rejection of independent claims 10, 13, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants have amended the subject matter of objected to claim 39, as well as intervening claim 38, into independent claim 13. Thus, per the Office Action, claim 13 is now allowable.

Additionally, Applicants have amended subject matter they believe to be analogous to that of claims 38 and 39 into independent claims 10 and 26. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are now allowable as well.

Further, without acquiescing to any arguments made in the Office Action and not addressed herein, Applicants submit that all dependent claims are also allowable at least for the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

4. Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Applicants express appreciation for the Examiner's statement that claim 39 recites allowable subject matter. Applicants understand that the Examiner has thoroughly examined the claim and prior art of record and has concluded that the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest the entirety of each combination of steps and/or structure recited by the allowed claim.

Applicants also understand that the Examiner has found the claim as a whole to patentably distinguish over the art of record, and that patentability of the claim does not rest on only those aspects that the Examiner listed in the reasons for allowance.

Additionally, Applicants submit that the reasons for allowance are clear from the record of prosecution as a whole, and that the Examiner's statements regarding the allowability of claim 39 are unnecessary.

5. Summary

Applicants respectfully submit that, in view of the remarks above, all claims are in condition for allowance and solicit action to that end. If there are any matters that may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at (312) 913-3361.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen

Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: January 13, 2011

By: /Michael S. Borella/
Michael S. Borella
Reg. No. 62,361